The Frustration effect on the explosive synchronization

Xu Can,[1] Yuting Sun,[1] Xia Huang,[2] Gao Jian,[1] and Zhigang Zheng[1,*]

[1]*Department of Physics and the Beijing-Hong Kong-Singapore Joint Centre for Nonlinear and Complex Systems (Beijing), Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*

[2]*Department of Mathematics and Physics, North China Electric Power University,Beijing 102206, China*

(Dated: April 1, 2014)

This paper deals with the emergence of explosive synchronization in scale-free networks by considering the Kuramoto model of coupled phase oscillators. The natural frequencies of oscillators are assumed to be correlated with their degrees, and the frustration effect is included in the system. This assumption allows enhancing and delaying the explosive transition to reach a synchronous state, the desynchronization effect is found and the continuity of phase transition is changed. We provide an analytical treatment developed in a star graph, which reproduces results obtained in scale-free networks, a self consistant approach is proposed to explain desynchronization Our findings have important implications in controlling synchronization in complex networks since the frustration is a controllable parameter in experiment, and a discontinuous abrupt in engineering is always dangerous.

arXiv:1403.8012v1 [nlin.AO] 31 Mar 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Synchronization as one of the most captivating cooperative phenomena, which is a universal concept in nonlinear sciences and non-equilibrium physics [1–6]. it widely exists in biological, chemical, physical, and social systems. However,as a typical example in non-equilibrium phase transition, the intrinsic microcosmic mechanism of it may not be well understood. As a phenomenological theory, in the 1970's, Kuramoto proposed a mathematical tractable model, which consists of an ensemble of coupled phase oscillators having their natural frequencies ω_i and distributed according to some specific probability density function $g(\omega)$ (for simplicity such as unimodal, symmetrical). The dynamic equation of each oscillator θ_i was defined as

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i), \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \quad (1)$$

where λ symbols the coupled strength, ω_i the intrinsic frequencies, and A_{ij} are the elements of of the adjacency matrix A, which represents the topology structure of a network. Generally the elements $A_{ij} = 1$, if two nodes i and j are connected, whereas, $A_{ij} = 0$. The original interaction between any two oscillators was identical [1], which refers to an all to all connected network. It has been proved that under this circumstances, when the coupled strength higher than a determined threshold λ_c the system would produce the onset of synchronization, which emerges a continuous phase transition. To measure the degree of synchronization of the system,the mean field approach was used and the complex-valued order parameter was introduced as

$$r(t)e^{i\psi(t)} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} e^{i\theta_j}, \quad (2)$$

where $r(t)$ with $0 \le r(t) \le 1$ measures the coherence of oscillator population,and $\psi(t)$ the average phase. When $r(t) = 1$, the system reaches the complete synchronous state. Otherwise, when $r(t) \approx 0$, it gets an incoherent state.

Recent researches have shown that the topological structures of networks strongly influence the synchronization process [7–16].The seminal work of Gomez-Gardenes et al.[7] investigated the Kuramoto model in networks, which shows that the positive correlation between the nodes'degrees and frequencies would lead to a first-order phase transition in scale-free networks. On the contrary, WeiQing Liu et al.[8] studied the negative microscopic correlation between frequencies and degrees,which shows that the explosive synchronization was replaced by a kind of hierarchical synchronization. The time-delayed coupling was considered in [9] whose assumption allows enhancing the explosive transition. I.Leyva and A.Navas et al. [12] investigated the emergence of dynamical abrupt transitions in a general network and set conditions for the transition from continuous second-order to a sharp, discontinuous first-order phase transition. Liuhua Zhu et al.[10] revealed that only when the degrees and frequencies of the network's nodes are both disassortative can an explosive synchronization occur.

Up to now, the investigations on the explosive synchronization have focused on the topological configuration of networks and the coupled forms of oscillators [15]. The effect of frustration on the synchronization process has been concerned [20]. Frustration is an important parameter in the spin Heisenberg XY model [17], the coupled Josephson-junction arrays or ladders and other systems that have potential applications [18], and frustration can be experimentally implemented by adding a magnetic field [19]. This paper deals with the explosive synchro-

*zgzheng@bnu.edu.cn

nization in the BA scale-free networks by considering the frustration effect, which would change the synchronization process dramaticlly, and also the natural frequencies of nodes are assumed to be positive correlated to their degrees.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II we give the model of coupled oscillators by taking the frustration effect into the scale-free networks and depict the main results obtained through numerical simulations, which reflects that when the frustration is small, the synchronization may be enhanced, whereas in some phase interval, frustration can induced the desynchronization and even complete incoherent. As a matter of fact the continuity and critical coupled strength for the onset of phase transition may be changed dramatically. In Sec.III we provide an analytical treatment in a star graph whose similar results obtained in scale-free networks, and also a self-consistent model was proposed to explain the regime of desynchronization. In Sec.IV we make the conclusions and interpret the potential meaning of this topic.

II. THE MODEL AND THE RESULTS

Followed the analyzes of Gomez-Gardenes et al. [7],an undirected and unweighted scale-free network of N coupled phase oscillators with the following equations are considered:

$$\frac{d\theta_i}{dt} = \omega_i + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{N} A_{ij} \sin\left(\theta_j - \theta_i - \alpha\right), i = 1, \ldots, N, \quad (3)$$

where α is an angle represents the frustration factor.According to the symmetry of trigonometric function, the interactions of the phase is $[0, \pi]$, which we just need to deal with. For the sake of simplicity we set $\omega_i = k_i, k_i$ is the degree of the node which follows the distribution of power law with an average $\langle k \rangle = 6$. Figure 1 shows the synchronization diagram $r(\lambda)$ with a scale free topology with $N = 100$ and $N = 400$ respectively. To understand deeply the change of the order of the synchronization transition, we have computed the effective frequency which is defined as

$$\omega_i^{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{T} \int_{\tau}^{\tau+T} \dot{\theta}_i(\tau) d\tau, \quad (4)$$

with $T > 1$. For clarity we have chosen several typical nodes whose degree is discrete distributed and the size of the network is $N = 100$ since the results described below do not change qualitatively for larger systems. From the panels of Figure 1 and Figure 2 it is clear that the presence of frustration in small phase interactions allows reaching the synchronous state with smaller coupled strength than without frustration yet in large frustration the couplings may be large. Especially when the frustration is $\alpha = 0.5\pi$ the system will never be synchronous.



FIG. 1: (Color online) The panels show the order parameter in scale free network with different frustration factor $(a)\alpha = 0$,$(b)\alpha = 0.1\pi$,$(c)\alpha = 0.3\pi$ and $(d)\alpha = 0.5\pi$,the size of system is $N = 100$.and $N = 400$



FIG. 2: (Color online) The panels show the effective frequency of different nodes with different frustration factor $(a)\alpha = 0$,$(b)\alpha = 0.1\pi$,$(c)\alpha = 0.3\pi$ and $(d)\alpha = 0.8\pi$,the size of system is $N = 100$.

In addition, it is interesting to observe that the continuity of phase transitions is changed in some Intervals which is similar as considering the time-delay in Ref. [8]. However,as a peculiar phenomenon, the system exhibits the behavior of desynchronization, which means the synchronous effective average frequency will disperse with the coupling strength is increasing.

III. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

In order to locally investigate the effect of the frustration on oscillators synchronization. Firstly we analyze the two oscillators system as the foundation and compari-



FIG. 3: (Color online) The panels show the order parameter of two oscillators with different frustration factor $(a)\alpha = 0$,$(b)\alpha = 0.3\pi$,$(c)\alpha = 0.5\pi$ and $(d)\alpha = 0.8\pi$.

son of the following many body discussion. The equations of motion of two limit cycle oscillators with frustration are

$$\dot{\theta_1} = \omega_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sin(\theta_2 - \theta_1 - \alpha), \tag{5}$$

$$\dot{\theta_2} = \omega_2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\sin(\theta_1 - \theta_2 - \alpha), \tag{6}$$

Eq.(5) minus Eq.(6), the phase difference ϕ equation follows

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\phi} &= \Delta\omega - \frac{\lambda}{2}(\sin(\phi+\alpha) + \sin(\phi-\alpha)),\\ &= \Delta\omega - \lambda\sin\phi\cos\alpha,\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

without loss of generality we assume $\Delta\omega \geq 0$, from Eq.(7) we get the condition for synchronization is $\Delta\omega \leq \lambda\cos\alpha$, and the critical coupling strength is

$$\lambda_c = \frac{\Delta\omega}{\cos\alpha}, \tag{8}$$

which is obvious that when $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2}$ then $\lambda_c \to \infty$, the system will never be synchronous. To quantitatively describe the influence of frustration, we need to know the accurate expressions for order parameter $r(\alpha,\lambda)$ and the synchronous effective average frequency $\Omega(\alpha,\lambda)$. According to the definition of Eq.(2)

$$re^{i\psi} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{2} e^{i\theta_i} = e^{i\theta_1}(1+e^{i\phi}), \tag{9}$$

the square of the model of order parameter is, $r^2 = \frac{1}{2}(1+\cos\phi)$ for the non-synchronization state Eq.(7) has no fixed points and the phase difference is varying in the range $[0, 2\pi]$, the probability to find the phase difference in the interval $(\phi, \phi+d\phi)$ is proportion to $\dot{\phi}$. its contribution to the order parameter is

$$\begin{aligned}r_{as}^2 &= \int_0^{2\pi}\frac{1}{2}(1+\cos\phi)P(\phi)d\phi\\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{\cos\phi\cdot C}{\Delta\omega - \lambda\sin\phi\cos\alpha}d\phi,\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where C is normalization constant, and it is clear that the second term of above is zero, similarly for the synchronization state the Eq.(7) has fixed points $\dot{\phi} = 0$

$$\Delta\omega - \lambda\sin\phi\cos\alpha = 0, \tag{11}$$

if $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ which means $\cos\alpha > 0$ and it is easy to know [21] that the stable solution with the phase difference $\phi \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$.Thus, the synchronous order parameter follows

$$\begin{aligned}r_s^2 &= \frac{1}{2}(1+\cos\phi)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{\Delta\omega}{\lambda}\right)^2\frac{1}{\cos^2\alpha}}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

on the contrary, if $\alpha \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$ which means $\cos\alpha < 0$, and the stable solution with the phase difference $\phi \in (\pi, \frac{3\pi}{2})$ the synchronous order parameter follows

$$\begin{aligned}r_s^2 &= \frac{1}{2}(1+\cos\phi)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{\Delta\omega}{\lambda}\right)^2\frac{1}{\cos^2\alpha}}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

summing Eq.(5) and Eq.(6), the the effective frequency is obtained

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega &= \frac{\omega_1+\omega_2}{2} + \frac{\lambda}{4}(\sin(\phi-\alpha) - \sin(\phi+\alpha))\\ &= \frac{\omega_1+\omega_2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2}\cos\phi\sin\alpha,\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

according to the discussion above, finally we can obtain the effective average frequency

$$\Omega = \begin{cases}\bar{\omega} - \dfrac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{1 - \left(\dfrac{\Delta\omega}{\lambda}\right)^2\dfrac{1}{\cos^2\alpha}}\sin\alpha,\\ \bar{\omega} + \dfrac{\lambda}{2}\sqrt{1 - \left(\dfrac{\Delta\omega}{\lambda}\right)^2\dfrac{1}{\cos^2\alpha}}\sin\alpha,\end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where $\bar{\omega} = \frac{\omega_1+\omega_2}{2}$ is the effective average frequency without frustration, and the minus corresponds to the phase range $\alpha \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$,and positive sign with the range $\alpha \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi)$. From the panels of Figure 3 and Figure 4, we



FIG. 4: (Color online) The panels show the effective frequency of two oscillators with different frustration factor $(a)\alpha = 0,(b)\alpha = 0.3\pi,(c)\alpha = 0.5\pi$ and $(d)\alpha = 0.8\pi$.



FIG. 5: (Color online) The panels show the order parameter of different size of star network with different frustration factor$(a)\alpha = 0,(b)\alpha = 0.01\pi,(c)\alpha = 0.1\pi,(d)\alpha = 0.3\pi$ $,(e)\alpha = 0.5\pi$ and $(f)\alpha = 0.8\pi$.

can see that the only effect of frustration is to postpone the process of synchronization and since the system lock phase, the average frequency will piece together and the phenomenon of desynchronization can not be found, and also as a matter of fact, when $\alpha < 0.5\pi$ the effective average frequency is stretching downward, and $\alpha > 0.5\pi$ the frequency is stretching upward, The most extreme situation is $\alpha = 0.5\pi$ the two effective frequency will never intersect.it is worth mentioning that the order parameter is a concept of mean field, the system should satisfy thermodynamic limit in principle. So when the size of system is too small the order parameter may not depict the state well.

To better obtain analytical insights on how the present of frustration factor is related to the behavior of synchronization. we reduce the problem studied to the analysis of the star configuration, a special topology structure that grasp the main property of SF networks ,i.e, a central node hub connected with K leaves. In star network the coupled pattern is one to one, which is similar to the two oscillators. Thus the size of the system is $N = K + 1$ the peripheral node has degree $k_i = 1$ and the hub has degree $k_h = K$. Fig.5 shows the order parameter in star network with different size, the results obtained is same as in SF network. Setting the rotated frame with the average phase $\psi(t) = \Omega(t) + \psi(0)$, where Ω is the effective average frequency of the system, we defined the phase difference as $\phi_h = \theta_h - \psi(t)$ for the hub and $\phi_j = \theta_j - \psi(t)$ for the leaves. These definitions allowed rewriting Eq.(3) into the set of equations given by

$$\dot{\phi_h} = (\omega_h - \Omega) + \lambda \sum_{j}^{K} \sin(\theta_j - \theta_h - \alpha), \tag{16}$$

$$\dot{\phi_j} = (\omega_j - \Omega) + \lambda \sin(\theta_h - \theta_j - \alpha), \tag{17}$$

without loss of generality, we set $\psi(0) = 0$, the order parameter defined in Eq.(2) can be written in another form

$$re^{i\psi(t)} = \frac{e^{i\theta_h} + \sum_{j=1}^{K} e^{i(\theta_j - \alpha)}}{1 + K}, \tag{18}$$

multiplying by $e^{-i\theta_h}$ on both sides of the Eq.(18) and take the imaginary part, the equations for the hub and leaves can be rewritten as

$$\dot{\phi_h} = (\omega_h - \Omega) - (1 + K) r\lambda \sin\theta_h, \tag{19}$$

$$\dot{\phi_j} = (\omega - \Omega) + \lambda \sin(\phi_h - \phi_j - \alpha), \tag{20}$$

imposing the stationary state solution $\dot{\phi_h} = 0$

$$\sin\phi_h = \frac{\omega_h - \Omega}{\lambda r(1 + K)}, \tag{21}$$

considering the equations for the leaves Eq.(20), and we evaluate the expression for $\cos(\phi_j + \alpha)$ in the locked regime

$$\cos(\phi_j + \alpha) = \cos(\phi_j + \alpha + \phi_h - \phi_h)$$

$$= \frac{\Omega - \omega}{\lambda} \sin\phi_h \pm \frac{\sqrt{(1 - \sin^2\phi_h)(\lambda - (\Omega - \omega)^2)}}{\lambda}, \tag{22}$$

note that when the frustration $\alpha = 0$ the same result obtained in Ref.[7, 9],Eq.(22) is valid only for $\lambda \geq |\omega - \Omega(\lambda)|$, and it can be inferred that the necessary condition for the synchronization of critical coupling strength is $\lambda_c = |\omega - \Omega(\lambda)|$

To understand the regime of desynchronization, it is important to know the dependence of λ and effective average frequency Ω. When the system lock phase, all the nodes oscillate in the same effective average frequency, $\dot{\theta_h} = \Omega t$ for the hub and $\dot{\theta_i} = \Omega t, (i = 1, \ldots, K)$ for the leaves, Substituting these solutions in Eq.(19) and Eq.(20) and summing all the $K+1$ equations, we obtain the average frequency Ω

$$\Omega(\lambda) = \frac{2K}{k+1}(1 - \lambda \sin\alpha \cos(\phi_j - \phi_h)), \qquad (23)$$

considering the synchronization condition for the leaf nodes and using algebraic calculations. It can be inferred that the region of the stable solution (lock phase) is

$$(\phi_j - \phi_h + \alpha) \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}), \qquad (24)$$

finally we obtain the function between λ and Ω

$$\Omega(\lambda) = \frac{2k}{k+1}\big(1 - \sqrt{\lambda^2 - (\Omega(\lambda) - \omega)^2}\sin\alpha\cos\alpha + (\Omega(\lambda) - \omega)\sin^2\alpha\big), \qquad (25)$$

when the frustration $\alpha = 0$, the result obtained above is the effect average frequency $\Omega = \frac{2k}{k+1}$ which is independent of the coupled strength λ and also it is a general result of synchronization [7–9]. From the panels of Fig.6 the black imaginary line is the synchronization boundary, and the necessary condition for the system to lock phase is the finally effective average frequency must locate inside the black boundary. In Fig. 6(a) and Fig 6(f) the empty line presents the hysteresis, which have been proposed in Ref.[7–15], and is the remarkable characteristic of first phase transition. In Fig.6(b)-(d) there is a upper branch inside the boundary, which is nonphysical line, Analogy to the two oscillators system Fig.4 the possible present effect of frustration $\alpha < 0.5\pi$ is dissipative and $\alpha > 0.5\pi$ is stimulant. It is interesting that with the frustration increasing, the extent of the upper branch is growing, on the other hand, the extent of the down branch is decreasing under the restriction on synchronization boundary with the tendency to extrude the boundary, and under a specific coupled strength λ_{ds}, the coherent effective average frequency of the hub and nodes will disperse, finally when $\alpha = 0.5\pi$ the down branch vanishes and there is only a nonphysical branch inside the boundary, this scenario is related to an incoherent state and is certain in Eq.(8). In order to obtain the exact expression for the critical coupled strength of synchronization with frustration factor the Eq.(25) can be written as

$$\lambda^2 = a\Omega^2 + 2b\Omega + c, \qquad (26)$$



FIG. 6: (Color online) The panels show the simulative effective frequency of the hub nodes(the green) and the leaf nodes(the yellow) with different frustration factor$(a)\alpha = 0,(b)\alpha = 0.15\pi,(c)\alpha = 0.25\pi,(d)\alpha = 0.3\pi$,$(e)\alpha = 0.5\pi$ and $(f)\alpha = 0.8\pi$.the red line is Eq.(25)

where $a = 1 + \frac{(2\sin^2\alpha - \frac{K+1}{K})^2}{\sin^2 2\alpha}$, $b = -1 + \frac{2\cos^2\alpha(2\sin^2\alpha - \frac{K+1}{K})^2}{\sin^2 2\alpha}$, $c = 1 + \frac{4\cos^4\alpha}{\sin^2 2\alpha}$ is a constant. from the panels of Fig.6, it is obvious that the critical coupled strength for synchronization is the vertex of parabola, which refers to the condition $\frac{d\lambda}{d\Omega} = 0$, substituting into the Eq.26 the critical coupled strength for $\alpha < 0.5\pi$ is $\lambda = \sqrt{c - \frac{b^2}{a}}$, the limit case of small frustration is obtained

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\sqrt{c - \frac{b^2}{c}} = \frac{K-1}{K+1}, \qquad (27)$$

which is the same result in Ref.[7].When there is no frustration the hysteresis make the forward critical coupled strength large than Eq.(27). However, the intrinsic difference is the the continuity of phase transition will be changed and the hysteresis will vanish with a little frustration. From Fig[] the coupled strength is increasing with α while the whole tendency of it is small than non-frustration and the enhancement effect of frustration $\alpha < 0.5\pi$ is confirmed. From the panels of Fig.6 we can quantify determine the de-synchronization point λ_{ds} in specific frustration ($\alpha < 0.5\pi$) and also the backward

phase transition point λ_{bs} ($\alpha \geq 0.5\pi$).The first case is Eq.(27) intersects and tangents with the down boundary and the later is Eq (27) intersects and tangents with the up boundary, and we get

$$\lambda_{ds} = \frac{b+a}{a-1} = \frac{\frac{K-1}{K}}{2\sin^2\alpha - \frac{K+1}{K}} \qquad \alpha < 0.5\pi, \tag{28}$$

$$\lambda_{bs} = \frac{b+a}{1-a} = -\frac{\frac{K-1}{K}}{2\sin^2\alpha - \frac{K+1}{K}} \quad \alpha \geq 0.5\pi, \tag{29}$$

from which there is singularity in Eq.(28), $\alpha_0 = \arcsin\sqrt{\frac{K+1}{2K}}$, and $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0, \lambda_{ds} < 0$ which means there is no de-synchronization point in the interval, Equally in Eq.(29) the singularity is $\pi - \alpha_0$, and also $0.5\pi \leq \alpha < \pi - \alpha_0, \lambda_{bs} < 0$ which means in this angle interval, the system can never be synchronous.

To better understand the dynamic regime of de-synchronization, and considering the special topology configure of star network. Here we adopt another self-consistent method to deal with the dynamic behavior of star network. We assume the hub is a host node whose oscillation was influenced by the frustration and coupled strength only, and the peripheral nodes are driven by the hub. Then the Eq.(16),Eq.(17) can be reduced as

$$\dot{\theta_h} = \Omega_h = \omega_h + K\lambda\sin\Theta, \tag{30}$$

$$\dot{\theta_j} = \omega - \lambda\sin(\theta_j - \Omega_h t + \alpha), \tag{31}$$

and we assume $\Theta = \theta_j - \theta_h - \alpha$ is a constant, which refers the feedback from the peripheral nodes to the hub is negligible, we define $\theta'_j = \theta_j - \Omega_h t + \alpha$ and obtain

$$\dot{\theta'_j} = (\omega - \Omega_h(\lambda)) - \lambda\sin\theta'_j, \tag{32}$$

from Eq.(32) it is obvious that the necessary condition for synchronization is $\lambda \geq |\omega - \Omega_h(\lambda)|$, also it can be conclude that the de-synchronization point is the solution of $\lambda = |\omega - \Omega_h(\lambda)|$, which implies

$$(K^2\sin^2\Theta - 1)\lambda^2 - 2K(1-K)\lambda\sin^2\Theta + (K-1)^2 = 0, \tag{33}$$

the roots of the above equation can be express as

$$\lambda_{12} = \frac{1-K}{K\sin\Theta \mp 1}, \tag{34}$$

where λ_1 is the point which the effect frequency will converge in, and λ_2 is the point of desynchronization we concerned, considering the lock phase Eq.(24), we assume $\theta_j - \theta_h = \frac{\pi}{2} - \alpha$ on edge of synchronization, from this approximation we obtain

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{\frac{K-1}{K}}{2\sin^2\alpha - \frac{K+1}{K}}, \tag{35}$$

which is same as Eq.(28) and the assumption is reasonable.Through this model the desynchronization phenomena can be understood that in some specific frustration with the increasing of λ the hub has no ability to drive the leaf to be synchronous, to be extreme, when $\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \alpha < \pi - \alpha_0$ the hub can never drive the leaf to be synchronous whenever the coupled strength.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

It is helpful to understand the model proposed in Ref.[7] by considering the frustration with a analytical treatment. In summary, we investigate the frustration effect on the explosive synchronization of BA scale free network. It is worth mentioning that the factor can accelerate and delay the process of synchronization, also the continuity of phase transition may be changed. In addition,a self-consistent approach was proposed to explain the regime of desynchronization in star network. Therefore, the inclusion of the frustration effect in the Kuramoto model of positive correlation with frequency and degree allows changing the dynamic process dramatically. This suggests a feasible scheme for engineering networks able to manipulate critical phenomena[21].Our study will pave the way for the study with similar abrupt dynamic structure in real world networks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

X.C., YT.S. and G.J. were supported partly by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11075016) and the Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (Grant No. 20100003110007). X.H. and ZG.Z. were supported partly by the National Basic Research Program of China (Program No. 2011CB710704).

[1] Y. Kuramoto, Chemical Oscillations, Waves and Turbulence(Springer, New York, 1984).
[2] J. A. Acebron, L. L. Bonilla, C. J. P. Vicente, F. Ritort, and R. Spigler, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 137 (2005).
[3] S. H. Strogatz, Physica D **143**, 1 (2000).
[4] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, Synchronization:A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2001), Vol. 12.
[5] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F.Mendes, Rev. Mod.Phys. **80**, 1275 (2008).
[6] Arenas A, Diaz-Guilera A, Kurths J, Moreno Y.and Zhou C, Phys. Rep., **469** (2008) 93.
[7] J. Gomez-Gardenes, S. Gomez, A. Arenas, and Y. Moreno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 128701 (2011).

[8] W. Q. Liu, Y.Wu, J. H. Xiao, andM. Zhan, Europhys. Lett. **101**,38002 (2013)

[9] T. K. D. M. Peron and F. A. Rodrigues, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 016102(2012)

[10] L.H. Zhu, L.Tian,and Daining.Shi,Phys. Rev.E **88**, 042921 (2013)

[11] Peng.Ji, Thomas K. DM. Peron, Peter J. Menck, Francisco A. Rodrigues, and Jurgen Kurths,Phys.Rev.Lett. **110**, 218701 (2013)

[12] I. Leyva, R. Sevilla-Escoboza, J. M. Buldu, I. Sendina-Nadal, J. Gomez-Gardenes, A. Arenas, Y. Moreno, S. Gomez,R. Jaimes-Reategui, and S. Boccaletti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**,168702 (2012)

[13] X.Zhang,X.Hu.J.Kurths, and Zonghua.Liu,Phys.Rev.E **88**, 010802(R) (2013)

[14] P. Li, K. Zhang, X. K. Xu, J. Zhang, and M. Small, Phys. Rev.E **87**, 042803 (2013).

[15] I. Leyva, A. Navas, I. Sendina-Nadal, J. A. Almendral, J. M.Buldu, M. Zanin, D. Papo, and S. Boccaletti, Sci. Rep. 3. 1281(2013)

[16] X.Huang,M.Zhan.F.Li, and Zhigang.Zheng,J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **47**,125101 (2014).

[17] Sakaguchi.H,Shinmoto.S.kuramoto.Y,Prog.Theor.Phys, **79**,1096(1998).

[18] Erez Berg, Ehud Altman, and Assa Auerbach, Phys. Rev. Lett. **11**,APRIL 2003.

[19] Yokoi.C,Tang.L.H,and Chou.W,Phys.Rev.B,37,2173(1988)

[20] Z.G.Zheng, Chin. Phys. **10** 0703(2001).

[21] Strogatz, S. H. Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos-With Applications to Physics, Biology,Chemistry and Engineering (Addison-Wesley, 1994).

[22] Z.G.Zheng, Sptiotemporal Dynamics and Collective Behaviors in Coupled Nonlinear Systems(Higher Education Press ,Beijing,2004).